

<b>PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW</b>		Docket Number (Optional) <b>MAT-8640US</b>	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to the USPTO on <u>October 14, 2010</u>		Application Number <b>10/522,059</b>	Filed <b>January 20, 2005</b>
Signature <u><i>Nicole May</i></u>		First Named Inventor <b>Jun Shinozaki et al.</b>	
Typed or printed name <u>Nicole May</u>		Art Unit <b>1716</b>	Examiner <b>Tiffany Z. Nuckola</b>

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).  
Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.  
See 37 CFR 3.7.1 Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/99)

☒ attorney or agent of record.  
Registration number 34,815

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.  
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 \_\_\_\_\_

*Lawrence E. Ashery*  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed or printed name

**610-407-0700**  
Telephone number

\_\_\_\_\_  
Telephone number

**October 14, 2010**  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

☒ \*Total of 3 forms are submitted

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing this form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Claims 1 and 4 respectively claim a method and an apparatus for manufacturing a plasma display panel by vapor deposition. Both claims currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Admitted Prior Art and Homme ( U.S. Patent No. 6,919,596). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 4 each require at least three protrusions extending to a height above the substrate. Neither the Admitted Prior Art nor Homme disclose this feature.

Appellant's claim 4 recites:

**...a plurality of first frames** for holding a plurality of substrates ..., said plurality of first frames being provided with a **protrusion [protrusion A]** between them **which extends ... to a height above the substrate greater than a height of the substrate ...**,

**a plurality of second frames ..., protrusions [protrusions B and C]** situated between each of the second frames and the plurality of first frames ..., **the protrusions also extending above the substrates ....**

(Emphasis and bracketed commentary added).

Page 3 of the Office Action states that the background art teaches an apparatus having "a plurality of first frames 2 ... [having] a protrusion between them which extends from below a bottom surface of the substrates 3 along a bottom surface of the substrate without being superimposed over the top surface of the substrate" and "a plurality of second frames having an opening 4, the protrusion between the substrate and the opening so that the substrate 3 is on one side of the protrusion and the opening 4 is on the other side of the protrusion ...."

The Examiner concedes that the background art does not teach that the protrusions extend to a height above the substrates greater than the height of the substrate. According to the Examiner, this limitation is supplied by Homme in Figures 7 and 8. Referring to Figures 7 and 8, Page 4 of the Office Action recites that "Homme teach[es] an apparatus/method for deposition comprising a substrate holder ... for deposition on a substrate 1, the substrate holder being configured with **a frame having a protrusion**, the protrusion extending [to a height above the substrate]. (Emphasis added).

These references do not render the invention of claim 4 obvious. Claim 4 requires "a plurality of first frames ... provided with a protrusion between them

which extends ... to a height above the substrate greater than a height of the substrate" and "a plurality of second frames ..., protrusions situated between each of the second frames and the plurality of first frames ..., the protrusions also extending above the substrates ...". As claimed, a substrate holder having the minimum number of two first frames would result in a sectional view of the substrate holder displaying **three** protrusions that extend to a height above the substrate. In other words, two protrusions (i.e., protrusions B and C) extend above the substrates at either end between the first and second frames, while another protrusion (i.e., protrusion A) extends above and between the two substrates held by the first frames. A sectional view consistent with this configuration is provided by Figure 3(b) of the instant application, with Element 5 representing the locations of the claimed minimum of three protrusions.

By contrast, Homme teaches an apparatus for holding a single substrate. A sectional view of the single substrate holder disclosed by Homme reveals only **two** protrusions that extend to a height above the substrate. In other words, Homme discloses protrusions extending above the substrate at either end (i.e., protrusions B and C), but fails to disclose a third protrusion located between a plurality of substrates (i.e., protrusion A). Because claim 4 of the instant application requires at least three protrusions extending to a height above the substrate, Homme cannot, in combination with the Admitted Prior Art, render claim 4 obvious.

Claim 1, while not identical to claim 4, is patentable over the background art and Homme for substantially similar reasons. Claims 2, 3, and 5-9 are patentable by virtue of their dependency upon claims 1 and 4.

Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance.